

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 11, 12, 14, and 16-20 are pending in this application. The Examiner has withdrawn claim 17 from consideration. In this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claim 11 and CANCELS claims 13 and 15.

Applicant affirms election of claims 11, 12, 14, 16, and 18-20. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin, consider, and allow claim 17 when generic claim 11 is allowed.

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohno et al. (U.S. 6,239,788) in view of Colgan et al. (U.S. 6,057,903). On page 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohno et al. in view of Colgan et al., and further in view of Takahata et al. (U.S. 2004/0239641). On page 6 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohno et al. in view of Colgan et al., and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 2003/0011583).

As noted above, Applicant has canceled claims 13 and 15. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 11, 12, 14, 16, and 18-20.

Applicant's Claim 1 recites:

A display system, which includes a display device and an input device, the input device being provided on a display section of the display device and having one or more conductive thin plates and being arranged to detect a position via which information is inputted from outside, said display system comprising:  
a display device driving section arranged to drive the display device;  
a signal application section arranged to apply, to the device having the one or more conductive thin plates, a noise canceling signal having an amplitude and a phase that are equal with an amplitude and a phase of a driving signal applied from the display device driving section to the display device;  
an input device control section to which a detection signal is applied, the detection signal being arranged to detect a position via which information is inputted from outside to the conductive thin plate; and

**a signal switching section arranged to select either the noise canceling signal or the detection signal so as to input the selected signal to the conductive thin plate.** (emphasis added)

In Section No. 4 on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the combination of Nohno et al. and Colgan et al. teaches the features recited in Applicant's claim 11. The Examiner alleged that the display device shown in Fig. 1 of Nohno et al. teaches the features recited in Applicant's claim 11 except for the feature of "a signal application section arranged to apply... a noise canceling signal having an amplitude and a phase that are equal with an amplitude and a phase of a driving signal applied from the display device driving section to the display device." The Examiner further alleged that the signal discussed in col. 1, ll. 60-67 of Colgan et al. corresponds to the noise canceling signal recited in Applicant's claim 11.

Col. 1, ll. 60-67 of Colgan et al. refers to Pepper, Jr. (U.S. 4,371,746), which teaches a signal that is applied to a guard layer **60** used in an add-on touch panel as shown in **Fig. 1b** of Pepper, Jr. Pepper, Jr. teaches that this guard layer **60** is a conductive metal plate embedded in a touch panel **10** shown in **Fig. 1a** of Pepper, Jr. Further, the signal that is applied to this guard layer **60** to eliminate the capacitance to ground is the exact same voltage  $V_s$  as is used to energize the touch panel **10**.

Applicant has amended claim 11 to recite the feature of "a signal switching section arranged to select either the noise canceling signal or the detection signal so as to input the selected signal to the conductive thin plate." Support for this feature is found, for example, Applicant's canceled claim 15 and paragraph [0047] of Applicant's substitute specification.

In the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that col. 12, ll. 31-41 of Nohno et al. teaches the feature of a signal switching section as now recited in Applicant's claim 11. However, col. 12, ll. 31-41 of Nohno et al. fails to even mention "noise cancelation." No other portion of Nohno et al. teaches or suggests selecting between a noise cancelation signal and a detection signal as now recited in Applicant's claim 11. Further, Pepper, Jr. teaches that the signal applied to the guard layer **60** is applied directly from the power source and thus, no selection occurs.

The Examiner has relied upon Colgan et al. to allegedly cure various deficiencies in Nohno et al. However, Colgan et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of “a signal switching section arranged to select either the noise canceling signal or the detection signal so as to input the selected signal to the conductive thin plate” in combination with the other features recited in Applicant’s claim 11.

Thus, none of Nohno et al., Colgan et al. and Pepper, Jr. teaches or suggests the feature of “a signal switching section arranged to select either the noise canceling signal or the detection signal so as to input the selected signal to the conductive thin plate” as recited in Applicant’s claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohno et al. in view of Colgan et al.

The Examiner has relied upon Takahata et al. and Yamazaki et al. to allegedly cure various deficiencies in the combination of Nohno et al. and Colgan et al. However, Takahata et al. and Yamazaki et al., applied alone or in combination with Nohno et al., Colgan et al., and Peppers, Jr., fail to teach or suggest the feature of “a signal switching section arranged to select either the noise canceling signal or the detection signal so as to input the selected signal to the conductive thin plate” in combination with the other features recited in Applicant’s claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claim 11 of the present application. Claims 11, 12, 14, 16, and 18-20 depend upon claim 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 11 is allowable. As noted above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin, consider, and allow claim 17 when generic claim 11 is allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Application No. 10/596,063  
September 23, 2009  
Reply to the Office Action dated June 23, 2009  
Page 8 of 8

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 23, 2009

/Peter Medley #56,125/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Peter Medley  
Registration No. 56,125